

REMARKS

Before addressing the Examiner's rejections, the Applicants note that claims 2, 3, 5, and 6, and 5-6 have been canceled. As such the rejection of these claims is moot. New claims 7 and 8 have been added for the consideration of the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (US 2002/0154364), hereinafter Green. After careful consideration, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4 to further define over Green. That is, claims 1 and 4 now clearly recite how the pilot beam is used for the optical axis matching, whereby the second optical wireless communications apparatus (40) has an optical receiver (14) with optical receiving areas (18 in Fig. 6) for receiving the pilot beam, the optical receiver being adjusted in directions of pan and tilt so that amounts of light of the pilot beam received at the optical receiving areas are equal to each other to have a match for an optical axis of the first optical wireless communications apparatus and another optical axis of the second optical wireless communications apparatus. Such is discussed at page 6, lines 15-28 of the Specification.

Claims 1 and 4 also recite that the first optical wireless communications apparatus (50) includes a control-signal receiver (2a, originally defined in canceled claim 2) for receiving an external remote control signal for controlling at least either the second optical wireless communications apparatus or an apparatus connected to the second optical wireless communications apparatus (see the Specification page 5, lines 7 to 11).

Furthermore, claims 1 and 4 recite that the modulator (Specification page 9, lines 3-8, Fig. 10) of the first communications apparatus (50) modulates the pilot beam with the external remote control signal (Specification page 5, lines 12-15). Whereas, the demodulator (Specification page 9, lines 15-23, Fig. 11) of the second communications apparatus (40) demodulates the modulated and transmitted pilot beam to reproduce the external remote control signal.

Moreover, claims 1 and 4 recite that the first communications apparatus (50) includes an optical receiver (11) (Specification page 6, lines 1-3) and the second communications apparatus (40) includes an optical transmitter (80) (Specification page 5, lines 22-24), for optical communication with an optical signal along the matched optical axes between the communications apparatuses.

In addition, new claims 7 and 8 are variations of claims 1 and 4, claims 7 and 8 reciting that the first optical wireless communications apparatus modulates the pilot beam with a specific signal that carries information on conditions of at least either the first optical wireless communications apparatus or an apparatus connected to the first optical wireless communications apparatus (originally recited in canceled claim 3), and the second optical wireless communications apparatus demodulates the modulated and transmitted pilot beam to reproduce the specific signal (Specification page 9, line 25 to page 10, line 8).

As such, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 now clearly recite the manner in which the pilot beam is used to achieve optical axis matching. In addition, the claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are further distinguishable from Green in that the message 12 taught by Green does not correspond to the pilot beam set forth in the claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, which is used to match the optical axes of the first and second communications apparatuses recited therein. This is in contrast to Green, which sets forth that the message 12 is carried by the optical beam 15, but does not teach or suggest using the message 12 to match the optical axes of the first and second communications apparatuses as recited in claims 1, 4, 7 and 8. Rather, Green teaches the use of the message 12 to transmit a desired television channel, and not to transmit a pilot beam that is used to match an optical axis of the first wireless communications apparatus and another optical axis of the second wireless communications apparatus.

Furthermore, the Examiner has also indicated that it is obvious that the axis must match in order for the Applicants' system to work, since optical signals are directional. However, Green does not teach or suggest anything regarding axis matching, thus Green does not teach or suggest a pilot beam that is used for axis matching as recited in claims 1, 4, 7, and 8.

Additionally, claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 differ from Green in that the pilot beam used for axis matching in claims 1 and 4 is modulated with an external remote control signal. The pilot beam in claims 7 and 8 is modulated by a specific signal that carries several types of information. Such modulation of a pilot beam as recited in claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 is not taught or suggested by Green.

Thus, because each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 is not taught or suggested by Green, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of such claims be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is the Applicants' position that claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration by the Examiner and the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Inasmuch as this application now contains four independent claims, the additional fee of \$200.00 is enclosed herewith. If this fee is not sufficient, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 18-0987.

If any further issues remain after this amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward G. Greive, Reg. No. 24,726
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
Fourth Floor, First National Tower
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants
July 5, 2007